In re: Lee et al.

Application No.: 10/622,278

Filed: July 18, 2003

Page 2 of 4

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the continued examination of the present application in the Official Action mailed May 4, 2005 (hereinafter the Official Action). Applicants also appreciate the allowance of Claims 16-28 and the indication that Claims 3-15 include patentable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten as suggested by the Examiner.

In response, Applicants maintain that Claims 1, 2, and 29 are patentable as the newly cited Tedrow reference does not disclose, for example, "a local row decoder configured to drive word lines coupled to a bank of a flash memory responsive to separate read and write control signals **provided thereto from outside the local row decoder circuit**." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of all rejections and the allowance of all claims for at least the reasons described herein.

Independent Claims 1 and 29 are patentable over Tedrow

Claims 1, 2, and 29 stand rejected under 35 § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 6,772,273 to Tedrow et al. ("Tedrow"). *Official Action, page 2*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1, 2, and 29, as Tedrow does not disclose or suggest:

a local row decoder circuit configured to drive word lines coupled to a bank of a flash memory responsive to <u>separate read and write</u> <u>control signals provided thereto from outside the local row decoder circuit</u>.

Independent Claim 29 includes similar recitations.

For example, as understood by Applicants, Tedrow does not disclose separate read and write control signals provided (to the local row decoder) from outside the local row decoder circuit as recited in independent Claim 1 and 29. As understood by Applicants, Tedrow focuses on a column decoder, not a row decoder. Furthermore, the discussion of the function of the row decoder 220 in Tedrow does not disclose or suggest that the local row decoder 220 receives separate read and write control signals provided thereto (*i.e.* to the local row decoder circuit) from outside the local row decoder circuit.

In contrast to Tedrow, in some embodiments according to the invention, as illustrated for example in Figure 3 of the present application, a local row decoder 305 receives separate read and write signals GWL0 R and GWL0 W from a global decoder 310. Accordingly,

In re: Lee et al.

Application No.: 10/622,278

Filed: July 18, 2003

Page 3 of 4

Applicants respectfully submit that Tedrow does not disclose or suggest, at least these recitations of Claims 1, 2, and 29 for at least the reasons discussed herein.

Respectfully, the entire rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 29 appears to be a restatement of Applicants claims annotated with what appears to be reference designators taken from Tedrow. For example, the Official Action appears to base the rejection, in-part, on a citation to elements 291, 192, and 294 of Tedrow as meeting recitations of separate read and write control signals provided thereto from outside the local row decoder circuit. Applicants are unable to locate these reference designators or any elements associated therewith in Tedrow. Furthermore, the supporting citations to passages of Tedrow appear to be to the entire detailed description of Tedrow, and is not more specific as to which portions thereof are alleged to disclose individual recitations of Applicants' claims. See for example Official Action, page 2 citing Figures 2 – 4 in columns 2 – 4. Accordingly, if the present rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request further information regarding which portions of Tedrow are alleged to disclose recitations of Applicants' claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have shown that Tedrow does not disclose or suggest the recitations of Claims 1, 2, and 29. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of all rejections and the allowance of the remaining claims in due course. If any informal matters arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned by telephone at (919) 854-1400.

Respectfully submitted,

Nobert N. Crouse Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 44,635

USPTO Customer No. 20792 Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec

Post Office Box 37428

Raleigh, North Carolina 27627

Telephone: 919/854-1400 Facsimile: 919/854-1401

In re: Lee et al.

Application No.: 10/622,278

Filed: July 18, 2003

Page 4 of 4

Certificate of Mailing under 37 CFR 1.8 (or 1.10)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, V4 22313 1450 on July 27, 2005.